

**UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE****United States Patent and Trademark Office**Address: COMMISSIONER OF PATENTS AND TRADEMARKS
Washington, D.C. 20231*AS*

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.
-----------------	-------------	----------------------	---------------------

09/214, 001 12/24/98 KUDO

H P17380

IM22/0427

EXAMINER

GREENBLUM & BERNSTEIN
1941 ROLAND CLARKE PLACE
RESTON VA 20191

VARCOE JR, F

ART UNIT

PAPER NUMBER

1764

14

DATE MAILED:

04/27/01

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Commissioner of Patents and Trademarks

Interview Summary

Application No. 09/214,001	Applicant(s) Kudo et al.
Examiner Varcoe	Group Art Unit 1764

All participants (applicant, applicant's representative, PTO personnel):

(1) Varcoe

(3) Arnold Turk

(2) Hien Tran

(4) _____

Date of Interview Apr 25, 2001

Type: a) Telephonic b) Video Conference
c) Personal [copy is given to 1) applicant 2) applicant's representative]

Exhibit shown or demonstration conducted: d) Yes e) No. If yes, brief description:

Claim(s) discussed: _____

Identification of prior art discussed:

Murray and Tanizaki

Agreement with respect to the claims f) was reached. g) was not reached. h) N/A

Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was agreed to if an agreement was reached, or any other comments:

Applicant argued that Murray discloses two shift reactors and that any modification of Murray for examination purposes must also contain two shift reactors. Furthermore, since claim 1 requires a CO oxidizer downstream from a shift reactor, any addition of Tanizaki's CO oxidizer to Murray's apparatus would have to place the oxidizer downstream from the final shift reactor, which is external to Murray's reformer apparatus, and therefore does not produce the apparatus of claim 1.

Examiner will reconsider upon receiving the response.

(A fuller description, if necessary, and a copy of the amendments which the examiner agreed would render the claims allowable, if available, must be attached. Also, where no copy of the amendments that would render the claims allowable is available, a summary thereof must be attached.)

i) It is not necessary for applicant to provide a separate record of the substance of the interview (if box is checked).

Unless the paragraph above has been checked, THE FORMAL WRITTEN REPLY TO THE LAST OFFICE ACTION MUST INCLUDE THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. (See MPEP section 713.04). If a reply to the last Office action has already been filed, APPLICANT IS GIVEN ONE MONTH FROM THIS INTERVIEW DATE TO FILE A STATEMENT OF THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. See Summary of Record of Interview requirements on reverse side or on attached sheet.

Hien Tran

HIEN TRAN
PRIMARY EXAMINER

Examiner Note: You must sign this form unless it is an Attachment to a signed Office action.